

REMARKS

1. Specification

The specification has been amended to provide application numbers for certain applications identified and incorporated by reference.

2. Claims

Claims 1 – 18 have been examined. Claims 1, 2, 4 – 8, 10, 11, and 13 – 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,559,999 (“Maturi”); and Claims 3, 9, 12, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Maturi.

Claims 1 – 3, 5, 6, 10 – 12, 14, and 15 have been canceled; Claims 4, 7 – 9, 13, and 16 – 18 have been amended; and Claims 19 – 26 have been added. These amendments are intended generally to clarify the scope of the invention, which is directed to synchronization of a digital video host system in which a receiver circuit and a decoder circuit are coupled only through a host-system bus (*see Application, Fig. 1 and p. 5, ll. 25 – 27*). The methods and systems that are recited provide for synchronization in a host system having such an arrangement, which has certain advantages discussed in the applications incorporated by reference on p. 4 of the application. Maturi does not disclose such an arrangement and is concerned with synchronization in a different context, namely with internal synchronization in a decoder 16. Broadly, Fig. 3 of Maturi resembles Fig. 1 of the application only to the extent that decoder 16 corresponds to the audio-visual interface 126 and that microcontroller 18/RAM 18a correspond to host CPU 122/host memory 124; the specific arrangement involving the segregation of the decoder circuit and receiver circuit embodied in the amended claims is not disclosed or suggested.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure in Maturi of synchronization with a system timestamp for an application system that is coupled with the decoder circuit but not with the

Appl. No. 09/650,329
Amdt. dated November 24, 2003
Reply to Office Action of September 12, 2003 (paper no. 6)

PATENT

receiver circuit, as is now recited explicitly in independent Claims 4 and 13. These claims are respectively method and system claims that partially incorporate limitations identifying the system timestamp explicitly from previous Claims 6 and 15. It is also noted that new dependent Claims 19 and 23 recite that an offset used to adjust the system timestamp have a nonunitary scaling (Application, p. 6, ll. 10 – 18), a feature that is neither taught nor suggested in Maturi. New independent Claims 20 and 24 correspond to original Claims 4 and 13, amended generally as described above but to incorporate limitations respectively from Claims 7 and 16 so that they are also pertinent to aspects of the host-system arrangement that is neither taught nor suggested by Maturi.

Examination of the claims as amended is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,


Patrick M. Boucher
Reg. No. 44,037

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
PMB:pmb
60088150 v1